

Title: A niche remedy for the dynamical problems of neutral theory

Authors: Andrew E. Noble^{1,2} and William F. Fagan¹

Affiliation: ¹Department of Biology,
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

²Department of Environmental Science and Policy,
University of California, Davis, California 95616, USA

Abstract: We demonstrate how niche theory and Hubbell's original formulation of neutral theory can be blended together into a general framework modeling the combined effects of selection, drift, speciation, and dispersal on community dynamics. This framework connects many seemingly unrelated ecological population models, and allows for quantitative predictions to be made about the impact of niche stabilizing and destabilizing forces on population extinction times and abundance distributions. In particular, the existence of niche stabilizing forces in our blended framework can simultaneously resolve two major problems with the dynamics of neutral theory, namely predictions of species lifetimes that are too short and species ages that are too long.

Keywords: biodiversity, niche theory, neutral theory, coexistence, extinction, selection, drift, speciation, dispersal, species lifetime problem, species age problem

Introduction

Niche theory and Hubbell's neutral theory (Hubbell, 2001) offer two distinct mechanisms for the long-term maintenance of biodiversity in competitive communities. In niche theory, if species limit themselves more than each other, then asymmetric, density-dependent interactions stabilize coexistence, and species composition remains invariant over long time scales (Chesson, 2000). In neutral theory, functionally equivalent species drift steadily to extinction, but speciation balances extinction to maintain an unstable coexistence (Caswell, 1976; Hubbell, 2001; Chave, 2004). In simulations where the only two free parameters are speciation and migration levels, Hubbell (2001) found remarkably good fits to data from various closed-canopy tree communities, the mixed mesophytic forest on the Cumberland Plateau of Kentucky, a planktonic copepod community of the northeastern Pacific gyre, and the bat community of Barro Colorado Island, among others. However, in fits to data from forest plots along the Manu River of Amazonian Peru, abundances for the top seven species exceeded the neutral prediction. Hubbell (2001) referred to these discrepancies as "ecological dominance deviations" and, in an extension of his simulation, found that small asymmetries in survival across species were sufficient to obtain a good fit. This empirical evidence of asymmetries was an early indicator of the need to blend niche and neutral theory.

The publication of Hubbell's book triggered a heated debate over the utility of a neutral theory for community ecology. The debate focused largely on neutral theory predictions for RSA data (Volkov et al, 2003; McGill, 2003; Volkov et al, 2005; Etienne, 2005; Etienne and Olf, 2005; Chave et al, 2006; Marani et al, 2006; Adler et al, 2007; McGill et al, 2007; Muneeppeerakul et al, 2008; Mutshinda et al, 2008; Jabot et al, 2008; Levine and HilleRisLambers, 2009; Volkov et al, 2009; Adler et al,

2010; Stokes and Archer, 2010; Ofițeru et al, 2010; Jeraldo et al, 2012). An important outcome of this debate was the recognition that both niche and neutral processes can generate similar RSA distributions (Chave et al, 2002; Purves and Pacala, 2005; Alonso et al, 2006; Kelly et al, 2008; Chisholm and Pacala, 2010; Noble et al, 2011), and that niche and neutral theory might be “two ends of a continuum” (Chase and Leibold, 2003, p. 179). Early efforts to explore that continuum in simulations (Tilman, 2004; Gravel et al, 2006) have been followed by analytical efforts to reconcile niche and neutral theory (Marani et al, 2006; Kadmon and Allouche, 2007; Etienne et al, 2007; Walker, 2007; Haegeman and Etienne, 2008; Loreau and de Mazancourt, 2008; Allouche and Kadmon, 2009; Mutshinda and O’Hara, 2011). The work of Haegeman and Loreau (2011) is particularly relevant here. By adding demographic stochasticity and immigration to a Lotka-Volterra model, they generated an analytical theory of local communities that combines niche and neutral dynamics. However, because the zero-sum rule is absent from the model of Haegeman and Loreau (2011), Hubbell’s original theory cannot be recovered as a limiting case.

The fundamental problem with neutral theories appears to lie not in its static estimates of RSA distributions but rather in its dynamical estimates of species lifetimes (Ricklefs, 2003; Nee, 2005; Ricklefs, 2006; Rosindell et al, 2010; Chisholm and O’Dwyer, 2014; O’Dwyer and Chisholm, 2014). The lifetime of a species in the metacommunity is commonly defined as the time period from speciation to extinction (see, e.g., (Chisholm and O’Dwyer, 2014)). Neutral theory with a point speciation mechanism (Hubbell, 2001) predicts expected species lifetimes – the mean value of the species lifetime distribution (Pigolotti et al, 2005) – that are too short when compared with data. This is the “species lifetime” problem (Chisholm and O’Dwyer, 2014). Neutral theory also predicts expected lifetimes for abundant species – due to fat, power-law tails in the species lifetime distribution (Pigolotti et al, 2005)

– that are too long. This is the “species age” problem (Chisholm and O’Dwyer, 2014). One solution to the species lifetime problem is protracted speciation, allowing for a transition period between the origination of a cryptic species and its taxonomic recognition, as suggested by (Ricklefs, 2003) and implemented by Rosindell et al (2010). However, empirical evidence that fitness differences have a strong impact on species lifetimes (Adler et al, 2010) indicates that a theory combining protracted speciation with niche forces would be a much more biologically realistic solution to the species lifetime problem. The species age problem has proven to be much more challenging to resolve within the neutral framework and may be impossible to resolve without the introduction of species asymmetries (Chisholm and O’Dwyer, 2014). One such solution, based on a combination of neutral theory and Red Queen dynamics, was recently proposed by O’Dwyer and Chisholm (2014). In general, efforts to merge niche and neutral dynamics into a common framework should enhance our understanding of the impact of community dynamics on extinction (Fagan and Holmes, 2006; Ovaskainen and Meerson, 2010) and, eventually, may improve the accuracy of important conservation and management tools, such as the population viability analysis (Leigh, 1981; Lande, 1993; Morris and Doak, 2003).

In this paper, we show how niche theory and Hubbell’s original formulation of neutral theory can be blended together into a single dynamical framework incorporating selection, drift (or demographic stochasticity), speciation, and dispersal – the four principal processes of community ecology as recently underscored by Vellend (2010). This model building exercise draws connections among many seemingly unrelated ecological population models and allows us to make quantitative predictions about the impact of niche stabilizing and destabilizing forces on population extinction times and abundance distributions. In particular, we discuss how niche stabilization can modify species lifetime distributions by simultaneously

increasing the mean values and eliminating the fat, power-law tails. This combined effect emerges dynamically from our blended framework and makes niche stabilization a natural biological mechanism for resolving the twin problems of short species lifetimes and long species ages in the dynamics of neutral theory.

Methods

Overview

We define a niche model based on the coupled ordinary differential equations of Lotka-Volterra dynamics, where

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} = n_i \left(r_i - \sum_{j=1}^S a_{ij} n_j \right), \quad (1)$$

for each of the species, labelled 1 through S . The n_i are abundances; the r_i are intrinsic growth rates; and the a_{ij} are per capita interaction strengths. This article will focus on the community dynamics of ecologically similar species where all interactions are competitive, i.e. $a_{ij} > 0$ for all i and j . The standard requirements for coexistence emerge from the simplest case. Consider a two-species community where intraspecific interactions are positive, i.e. $a_{11}, a_{22} > 0$. The coexisting fixed point

$$\begin{aligned} n_1^* &= \frac{a_{22}r_1 - a_{12}r_2}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}}, \\ n_2^* &= \frac{a_{11}r_2 - a_{21}r_1}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

is stable if (Vandermeer, 1975)

$$\begin{aligned} r_1 \frac{a_{21}}{a_{11}} &< r_2, \\ r_2 \frac{a_{12}}{a_{22}} &< r_1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We will refer to these inequalities as the “competitive stability criteria”. If all species are ecologically equivalent, such that $r_i = r$ and $a_{ij} = a$ for all i and j , the inequalities are violated and coexistence is neutrally stable. This phenomenology reflects Gause’s axiom that species must exhibit some degree of differentiation in order to stably coexist (Chase and Leibold, 2003). Furthermore, the competitive stability criteria imply that $a_{12}a_{21} < a_{11}a_{22}$, so the geometric mean of intraspecific competition must exceed the geometric mean of interspecific competition. This requirement for niche stabilization, that species limit themselves more than other species, was emphasized by Chesson (2000) in a closely related model.

Analysis of the niche dynamics in Eq. 1 provides important insights on the relationship between competition and coexistence but fails to quantify the fluctuations that may lead to extinction. Deterministic models, such as Eq. 1, approximate the mean dynamics of large populations where probabilities of extinction can be ignored on sufficiently short time scales. Smaller populations require a more mechanistic approach to capture the discrete nature of birth and death events and the uncertainty surrounding the timing of those events. In this context, exact population densities at future times cannot be predicted with certainty based on currently available information. To be specific, given a discrete vector of known initial community abundances, $\vec{N}(t = 0) = (N_1(t = 0), \dots, N_S(t = 0))$, we cannot predict an exact value for future abundances, $\vec{N}(t)$. Instead, we aim to predict the probability, $P_{\vec{n}}(t)$, of finding the community in state $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_S)$ at time t . $\vec{N}(t)$ is called a stochastic process and each reasonable \vec{n} is referred to as an accessible state. The time-dependent probability of each accessible state, $P_{\vec{n}}(t)$, is treated as a dynamical

variable that increases or decreases based on transition rates to and from other states

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_{\vec{n}}}{dt} = & \sum_{\text{all other states}} (\text{Rate of transition to } \vec{n} \text{ from other state}) \times P_{\text{other state}} \\ & - \sum_{\text{all other states}} (\text{Rate of transition to other state from } \vec{n}) \times P_{\vec{n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

This equation of motion for $P_{\vec{n}}(t)$, called a “master equation”, provides a powerful platform for mechanistic modeling in ecology (Nisbet and Gurney, 2003). In particular, a master equation framework not only captures extinction dynamics due to demographic fluctuations in small populations but also yields a prescription for the mean dynamics of large populations where fluctuations are small. Neutral theories that maintain diversity through a balance of speciation and extinction, such as Hubbell’s theory, are typically formulated as master equations.

In the sections to follow, we demonstrate that niche stabilization or destabilization can be added to neutral theories by expanding the master equations to allow for a density-dependent per capita rate of successful reproduction

$$w_{i,\vec{n}} \equiv w_{i,0} \exp \left(- \sum_{j=1}^S a_{ij} n_j / w_{i,0} \right). \quad (5)$$

We will refer to $w_{i,\vec{n}}$ as the ecological fitness of species i , with $w_{i,0}$ being the intrinsic, density-independent, ecological fitness of species i in the absence of competition. The neutral limit only obtains when the ecological fitnesses are the same for all species. The per capita interaction rates, a_{ij} , for each species i , are measured in the same units as the density-independent reproduction rate, $w_{i,0}$, such that the ratio $a_{ij}/w_{i,0}$ in the exponent of Eq. 5 is dimensionless. On an intuitive level, this parameterization may be the simplest way to allow species to limit themselves and each other while guaranteeing that ecological fitnesses are always positive, an important requirement for the master equations to follow. On a more formal level, we might consider $w_{i,\vec{n}}$ to

be an intrinsic ecological fitness, $w_{i,0}$, multiplied by the Poisson probabilities, $\exp(-a_{ij}n_j/w_{i,0})$, that no deaths occur due to interactions with species j . But regardless of its origin, we will demonstrate that the chosen form of density-dependent ecological fitness is remarkably useful in creating a non-neutral framework that combines niche dynamics and demographic stochasticity in a single theory. Niche mechanisms may stabilize or destabilize populations on intermediate time scales, while demographic stochasticity allows for a balance of extinction and speciation over long time scales. In the first two sections we demonstrate how density-dependent ecological fitness can stabilize or destabilize the simplest models of non-zero-sum and zero-sum stochastic dynamics. We then expand on the zero-sum model to generate a niche-based extension of Hubbell’s metacommunity and local community models. For each model, we quantify the impact of competitive niche dynamics on mean times to extinction in metacommunities and mean times to extirpation in local communities, where immigration allows populations to recover. After establishing this framework blending niche theory with Hubbell’s original formulation of neutral theory, we discuss a niche remedy for the problems of neutral dynamics that emerges naturally from our general model.

A blend of niche theory and a simple birth-death process

The non-zero-sum dynamics of a multivariate birth-death process are governed by the master equation

$$\frac{dP_{\vec{n}}}{dt} = \sum_{i=1}^S (g_{i\vec{n}-\vec{e}_i} P_{\vec{n}-\vec{e}_i} + r_{i\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i} P_{\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i} - g_{i,\vec{n}} P_{\vec{n}} - r_{i,\vec{n}} P_{\vec{n}}), \quad (6)$$

where $r_{i,\vec{n}}$ is the density-dependent rate of removal for an individual of species i , and $g_{i,\vec{n}}$ is the rate of gain. We assume a density-dependent per capita growth rate, $w_{i,\vec{n}}$,

but a density-independent per capita death rate, d_i , such that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{i,\vec{n}} &\equiv \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P\left(\vec{N}(t + \Delta t) = \vec{n} + \vec{e}_i \mid \vec{N} = \vec{n}\right)}{\Delta t} = w_{i,\vec{n}} n_i, \\ r_{i,\vec{n}} &\equiv \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P\left(\vec{N}(t + \Delta t) = \vec{n} - \vec{e}_i \mid \vec{N} = \vec{n}\right)}{\Delta t} = d_i n_i. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This is a simple birth-death process of neutral drift if $w_{i,0} = b$, $a_{ij} = 0$, and $d_i = d$ for all i and j , such that ecological fitness is density-independent and all species are equivalent. We now argue that density-dependent ecological fitnesses can generate stabilities or instabilities that promote or impede coexistence on intermediate time scales.

The mean dynamics of Eq. 6 are given by a system of ordinary differential equations where for each species i (Online Resource 1)

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} = n_i(w_{i,\vec{n}} - d_i), \quad (8)$$

and, in this context, $n_i = n_i(t)$ is a continuous variable. Some familiar models are obtained in various limits. For a single species system, a transformation to discrete time yields the Ricker model (Online Resource 2), so for two or more species, we have a generalization of the Ricker model to continuous-time community dynamics. We also recover the niche model upon taking a first-order expansion of the exponential that appears in $w_{i,\vec{n}}$ and identifying the $w_{i,0} - d_i$ with the r_i in Eq. 1. This approximation is valid where $\sum_{j=1}^S a_{ij} n_j \ll 1$ for every i .

The phenomenology arising from Eq. 8 is similar to results from the niche model. In a two-species community where $a_{11}, a_{22} > 0$, the fixed-point abundances

$$\begin{aligned} n_1^* &= \frac{a_{22} w_{1,0} \log(w_{1,0}/d_1) - a_{12} w_{2,0} \log(w_{2,0}/d_2)}{a_{11} a_{22} - a_{12} a_{21}}, \\ n_2^* &= \frac{a_{11} w_{2,0} \log(w_{2,0}/d_2) - a_{21} w_{1,0} \log(w_{1,0}/d_1)}{a_{11} a_{22} - a_{12} a_{21}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

are positive and stable, in the mean dynamics of Eq. 8, for

$$\begin{aligned} w_{2,0} \log(w_{2,0}/d_2) \frac{a_{12}}{a_{22}} &< w_{1,0} \log(w_{1,0}/d_1), \\ w_{1,0} \log(w_{1,0}/d_1) \frac{a_{21}}{a_{11}} &< w_{2,0} \log(w_{2,0}/d_2). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

These criteria are identical to the competitive stability criteria if we identify $w_{1,0} \log(w_{1,0}/d_1)$ and $w_{2,0} \log(w_{2,0}/d_2)$ with r_1 and r_2 , respectively. In particular, stable coexistence hinges on familiar niche mechanisms: species must be asymmetric such that the geometric mean of intraspecific competition exceeds the geometric mean of interspecific competition. A niche-stabilized fixed-point in the mean dynamics of Eq. 8 corresponds to a metastability in the stochastic process governed by Eq. 6 that promotes coexistence on intermediate time scales and delays extinction (Van Kampen, 2001, Ch. 8). By contrast, a niche-destabilized fixed-point in Eq. 8 corresponds to an instability in the stochastic process of Eq. 6 that impedes coexistence and can accelerate extinction.

A blend of niche theory and a simple Moran model

Thus far, we have only considered a blend of niche theory with a non-zero-sum birth-death process. However, Hubbell's original formulation of neutral theory is a zero-sum process that adds speciation and migration dynamics to the simple birth and death dynamics of a simple, univariate Moran model. Before investigating a blend of niche theory and Hubbell's zero-sum neutral theory, we take the first step of integrating niche theory with a multivariate Moran model for the dynamics of S species and J individuals. The accessible states, $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_S)$, must satisfy $0 \leq n_i \leq J$ for each i and $\sum_{i=1}^S n_i = J$. The stochastic process follows a simple multivariate Moran model (see, e.g., Ewens (2004)), where the master equation can be

written as

$$\frac{dP_{\vec{n}}}{d\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^S \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^S (T_{i,j,\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i-\vec{e}_j} P_{\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i-\vec{e}_j} - T_{j,i,\vec{n}} P_{\vec{n}}) \Theta_{ij\vec{n}}, \quad (11)$$

with a dimensionless measure of time, τ . The $\Theta_{ij\vec{n}} \equiv \Theta(J - (n_i + 1))\Theta(n_j - 1)$, where $\Theta(x)$ is zero for $x < 0$ and one otherwise, ensure that transitions to inaccessible states are not included in Eq. 11. A common death rate sets the overall timescale in the zero-sum transitions given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{i,j,\vec{n}} &\equiv \lim_{\Delta\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{P(\vec{N}(\tau + \Delta\tau) = \vec{n} - \vec{e}_i + \vec{e}_j | \vec{N} = \vec{n})}{\Delta\tau} \\ &= \frac{n_i}{J} \left(\frac{w_{j,\vec{n}-\vec{e}_i} n_j}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_{k,\vec{n}-\vec{e}_i} n_k - w_{i,\vec{n}-\vec{e}_i}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The probability of species i being selected for death is just the relative abundance, n_i/J , of species i . The probability that species j recruits and establishes in the vacancy left by species i is determined by drawing from the available pool of offspring in which the representation of species k is determined by $w_{k,\vec{n}} n_k$. Various subtractions in the expression for $T_{i,j,\vec{n}}$ account for the death in species i that precedes the reproduction, recruitment, and establishment of species j . Eq. 11, with Eq. 12, reduces to a simple model of zero-sum neutral drift in a symmetric community where $w_{i,0} = b$ and $a_{ij} = a_j$ for all i and j . The former condition ensures that intrinsic fitnesses are equivalent, while the latter ensures the absence of a niche stabilizing mechanism; together, these conditions are the requirements for neutrality highlighted by Adler et al (2007). Breaking these symmetries allows for niche stabilization and destabilization.

The mean dynamics of Eq. 11, when written in terms of $p_i \equiv n_i/J$, take the form of a Levins model (Levins and Culver, 1971). For sufficiently weak competitive asymmetries such that $w_{i,\vec{n}} \ll \sum_{k=1}^S w_{k,\vec{n}} n_k$ and $a_{ij} \ll \sum_{k=1}^S a_{ik} n_k$ for every i and j ,

we have (Online Resource 1)

$$\frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = c_i(\vec{p})p_i(1 - p_i) - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^S c_j(\vec{p})p_i p_j, \quad (13)$$

where

$$c_i(\vec{p}) = \frac{w_i(\vec{p})}{J \sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})p_k}. \quad (14)$$

Each $w_i(\vec{p})$ is obtained from the expression for $w_{i\bar{n}}$ with the substitution of $p_i J$ for n_i . The mean dynamics of Eq. 13 prescribe zero-sum niche dynamics for a community with any given number of species and individuals (Online Resource 3). The phenomenology is remarkably similar to the niche model for a two-species system, and we will refer to Eq. 13 as a ‘‘Levins niche model’’. Fixed-point relative abundances

$$\begin{aligned} p_1^* &= \frac{B_2}{B_1 + B_2}, \\ p_2^* &= 1 - p_1^*, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= a_{11}J/w_{1,0} - a_{21}J/w_{2,0} - \log(w_{1,0}/w_{2,0}), \\ B_2 &= a_{22}J/w_{2,0} - a_{12}J/w_{1,0} + \log(w_{1,0}/w_{2,0}), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

are positive and stable for

$$\begin{aligned} w_{1,0} \frac{e^{a_{21}J/w_{2,0}}}{e^{a_{11}J/w_{1,0}}} &< w_{2,0}, \\ w_{2,0} \frac{e^{a_{12}J/w_{1,0}}}{e^{a_{22}J/w_{2,0}}} &< w_{1,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which implies that $a_{12}a_{21} < a_{11}a_{22}$. The correspondence is clear to the competitive stability criteria and to the familiar mechanisms of niche stabilization and destabilization. We find that zero-sum assumptions do not have a strong impact on

niche dynamics for large communities where the mean dynamics are a good approximation to the underlying stochastic processes of birth, death, and competition. This result parallels the conclusion of Etienne et al (2007) that zero-sum assumptions do not have a strong impact on neutral dynamics in high-diversity communities.

Results

The preceding section has demonstrated how a standard niche model can be incorporated into standard models for demographic stochasticity. We now apply that formalism to quantify the impacts of competition on extinction and to blend a standard niche model with Hubbell’s original formulation of neutral theory.

Impacts of competition on extinction

If the first species competes with one or more symmetric species, the full multivariate stochastic dynamics of Eq. 11 can be reduced to a univariate master equation for the marginal dynamics of the first species (Online Resource 4). Fig. 1 plots the temporal evolution of the conditional abundance probability distribution, $P_{cn_1, \tau}$, as determined by Eq. OR.4.1 after excluding situations in which the first species reaches total extinction or complete dominance. Panels 1a, 1b, and 1c correspond, respectively, to scenarios of neutrality, interspecific exceeding intraspecific competition, and intraspecific exceeding interspecific competition. In all cases, the conditional probabilities approach a quasi-stationary distribution at long times. Compared to the neutral case, an excess of interspecific competition destabilizes the system by inducing a bimodal distribution where one of the two species dominates over short time scales with a high probability. This bistability corresponds to an unstable fixed-point of the mean dynamics and signals a stochastic Allee effect that accelerates the extinction of rare species. By contrast, an excess of intraspecific

competition generates a single peak in the conditional distribution. This peak is a metastability that corresponds to a stable fixed-point of the mean dynamics. In the $J \rightarrow \infty$ limit, the peaks of $P_{c_{n_1}, \tau}$ approach delta functions, demographic stochasticity vanishes, and the mean dynamics of the Levins niche model (Eq. 13) are recovered. For finite J , absorbing states guarantee monodominance by a single species at long times, while niche dynamics accelerate or delay extinction on intermediate time scales.

In Online Resource 5, we extend the multivariate Moran model and its mean dynamics to allow for empty space. Summations run to $S + 1$ and the stochastic variable $N_{S+1}(\tau)$ tracks the number of unoccupied patches. For large zero-sum communities where the vast majority of spaces are unoccupied, population dynamics are well-approximated, after a rescaling of time, by non-zero-sum dynamics. Fig. 2 summarizes connections among the blended stochastic processes and deterministic models developed in the first part of this paper. All models contain a neutral theory in the symmetric limit.

Of course, neither of the two stochastic frameworks discussed thus far offers a valid model of biodiversity over long time scales. In the simple birth-death process, each species will either become extinct or approach infinite abundance. In the simple Moran model, a single species will dominate. The next two sections extend the Moran model of Eq. 11 by allowing speciation or migration to remove the absorbing states at monodominance that inhibit the long-term maintenance of species diversity. These non-neutral frameworks inherit the niche dynamics of our simple Moran model but yield Hubbell’s theory of metacommunities and local communities in the neutral limit.

A blend of niche theory and Hubbell’s neutral theory of the metacommunity

A previous extension of Hubbell’s metacommunity theory, with point-speciation, allowed for asymmetries in ecological fitness and speciation probability (Box 1,

Eq. B1.1). We now expand on that asymmetric framework by introducing density-dependence in ecological fitness. To do this, we replace all the density-independent w_i that appear in Eq. B1.1 by the density-dependent $w_{i,\vec{n}-\vec{e}_i}$ to obtain a new master equation. The simple Moran model is recovered when all speciation probabilities vanish, and a multivariate formulation of Hubbell's metacommunity theory is included as the symmetric limit. The mean dynamics approximating our non-neutral metacommunity dynamics can be written as a Levins model, and we once again assume weak competitive asymmetries to obtain

$$\frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = s_i(\vec{p}) + c_i(\vec{p})p_i(1-p_i) - e(\vec{p})p_i - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^S c_j(\vec{p})p_i p_j + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{S}\right), \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{O}(1/S)$ indicates additional terms that are negligible as the number of species becomes large and

$$\begin{aligned} s_i(\vec{p}) &= \frac{\nu_i}{J_M} \frac{w_i(\vec{p})}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})}, \\ c_i(\vec{p}) &= \frac{1-\nu_i}{J_M} \frac{w_i(\vec{p})}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})p_k}, \\ e(\vec{p}) &= \sum_{j=1}^S \frac{\nu_j}{J_M} \frac{w_j(\vec{p})}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In addition to colonization and competition, we now find a source term, with coefficient $s_i(\vec{p})$, and an extinction term, with coefficient $e(\vec{p})$, arising from nonzero speciation probabilities. Eq. 18 is similar to the replicator-mutator equation in population genetics (Ewens, 2004): all possible species must be enumerated, and in principle, an individual of any given species can give birth to an individual of any other species, consistent with the assumption of weak competitive asymmetries.

The mean dynamics of Eq. 18 approximate non-neutral metacommunity dynamics given any fixed number of species and individuals. In the neutral limit, we

find

$$\frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = \frac{\nu}{J_M} \left(\frac{1}{S} - p_i \right), \quad (20)$$

such that all species completely decouple. In the limit of an infinite number of species and individuals ($S, J_M \rightarrow \infty$), the p_i remain fixed at their initial values, which is the deterministic limit of neutral drift. For a nearly neutral metacommunity with low levels of speciation, a fixed-point analysis of Eq. 18 yields small corrections to the stability criteria of the simple Moran model (Online Resource 6), so we expect that our non-neutral metacommunity model inherits niche stabilization and destabilization mechanisms.

Confirmation is provided by a calculation of extinction times for the asymmetric species in a nearly neutral metacommunity (Online Resource 7). Fig. 3a plots τ_E against $p_{1,0} \equiv n_{1,0}/J_M$, while Fig. 3b plots the corresponding flows, $dp_1/d\tau$ versus p_1 , of the mean dynamics. In the fully neutral limit, demographic stochasticity drives all species toward extinction in the absence of a stabilizing mechanism (Chesson, 2000; Hubbell, 2001), and the mean dynamics yield a single stable fixed point at $p_1 = 0$. For the case where interspecific exceeds intraspecific competition, τ_E falls below (above) neutral expectations when $p_{1,0}$ is low (high). The existence of an inflection point in the τ_E versus $p_{1,0}$ curve signals a stochastic Allee effect, as discussed by Dennis (1989, 2002) and Allen et al (2005). Indeed, the mean dynamics exhibit upper and lower stable fixed points separated by an unstable threshold. The underlying bistability of the stochastic theory allows large initial populations of the asymmetric species to remain dominant on intermediate time scales, but large fluctuations below the unstable threshold rapidly reduce mean times to extinction. Only intraspecific exceeding interspecific competition raises τ_E above neutral expectations for all values of $p_{1,0}$. The corresponding mean dynamics include a stable fixed point that promotes

stable coexistence over intermediate time scales as well as an unstable fixed point that repels drift toward extinction.

A blend of niche theory and Hubbell's neutral theory of the local community

We now expand on an asymmetric extension of Hubbell's local community theory, as described in Box 1, by allowing for density-dependence in ecological fitness. The master equation is given by Eq. B1.3 with the replacement of each w_i by $w_{i,\bar{n}-\bar{e}_i}$. The simple Moran model is recovered in the limit where all immigration probabilities vanish, and the multivariate formulation of Hubbell's local community theory (Hubbell, 2001, p. 128) is included as the symmetric limit. The mean dynamics approximating our non-neutral local community dynamics can be written as a Levins model, and we assume weak competitive asymmetries to obtain

$$\frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = s_i(\vec{p}) + c_i(\vec{p})p_i(1 - p_i) - e(\vec{p})p_i - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^S c_j(\vec{p})p_i p_j, \quad (21)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s_i(\vec{p}) &= \frac{m_i}{J_L} \frac{w_i(\vec{p})x_i}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})x_k}, \\ c_i(\vec{p}) &= \frac{1 - m_i}{J_L} \frac{w_i(\vec{p})}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})p_k}, \\ e(\vec{p}) &= \sum_{j=1}^S \frac{m_j}{J_L} \frac{w_j(\vec{p})x_j}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k(\vec{p})x_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The x_i are relative metacommunity abundances that are assumed to be fixed in the dynamics of the local community (see Eq. B1.3). In Eq. 21, the source and extinction terms arise from nonzero immigration probabilities, and the mean dynamics approximate non-neutral local community dynamics given any fixed number of species and individuals. In the neutral limit, we have (Vallade and Houchmandzadeh, 2003)

$$\frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = \frac{m}{J_L}(x_i - p_i), \quad (23)$$

such that all species completely decouple and local relative community abundances track relative metacommunity abundances at equilibrium. Similarly, in the stochastic formulation of Hubbell’s local community, the expected relative abundance of species i is x_i at equilibrium (Hubbell, 2001). This provides a built-in mechanism for stabilizing coexistence: given a nonzero probability of immigration, high levels of diversity in the metacommunity guarantee high levels in the local community when abundances are averaged over long time scales. However, low immigration probabilities generate large fluctuations that destabilize local diversity on shorter time scales and prolong periods of extirpation. Expanding the equilibrium expression for relative fluctuation amplitude in Hubbell’s theory (Vallade and Houchmandzadeh, 2003) (see the two equations that follow their Eq. 7 and precede their Sec. III), we find (Online Resource 8)

$$\frac{\sqrt{\langle N_i - \langle N_i \rangle \rangle^2}}{\langle N_i \rangle} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{J_L}} \sqrt{\frac{1 - x_i}{m x_i}} + \mathcal{O}(J_L^{-3/2}), \quad (24)$$

so, for sufficiently small values of m , population fluctuations equal to the total number of individuals in the community become common, which implies a bimodal stationary distribution with peaks at extirpation and monodominance.

Our non-neutral framework extends Hubbell’s theory to allow for a niche mechanism that, despite low levels of immigration, promotes coexistence and lengthens the time to extirpation. To demonstrate this, we calculate a stationary distribution, $P_{n_1}^*$, for the asymmetric species in a nearly neutral local community (Online Resource 9). Averaging over long-term stochastic fluctuations, the relative amount of time that the asymmetric species spends in state n_1 is equal to $P_{n_1}^*$. Given $m_1 = m_2 \ll 1$, Fig. 4a plots stationary distributions for the asymmetric species in three scenarios, while Fig. 4b plots corresponding flows in the mean dynamics. In the fully neutral limit, the stationary distribution is bimodal with peaks at extirpation

and monodominance, and low probabilities of coexistence. When interspecific exceeds intraspecific competition, the mean dynamics exhibit an Allee effect where the unstable threshold at intermediate abundance corresponds to a further reduction in probabilities of coexistence for the stationary distribution (Dennis, 1989). By contrast, intraspecific exceeding interspecific competition induces a tri-stable distribution with a metastability for coexistence that reduces periods of extirpation and monodominance. That metastability corresponds to a stable fixed point of the mean dynamics, and for low levels of immigration, stability criteria are well-approximated by results for the simple Moran model (Online Resource 6).

Resolving species lifetime and age problems in the dynamics of neutral theory

Working from a preprint of this paper, Pigolotti and Cencini (2013) have studied our blend of niche theory and Hubbell's metacommunity theory in the limit of totally symmetric competition with deviations from the neutral limit governed by a single parameter. Species abundance distributions can be calculated analytically in this limit and the species lifetime distribution can be studied numerically. When intraspecific competition exceeds interspecific competition, Pigolotti and Cencini (2013) demonstrate that mean species lifetimes increase above neutral expectations and the variance of species lifetimes decreases. Importantly, niche stabilization truncates the fat, power-law tail of the species lifetime distribution, as predicted by neutral theory, with an exponential cutoff. In this way, niche stabilization provides a natural biological mechanism for resolving, simultaneously, the species lifetime and species age problems in the dynamics of neutral theory.

Other limits and extensions of our general theory may provide additional solutions to the species lifetime and age problems in neutral theory that are both analytically tractable and biologically well-motivated. For example, Ricklefs (2003)

suggested that the lifetime problem could be resolved if rare species enjoy a competitive advantage that increases persistence and that the age problem could be resolved if abundant species suffer occasional competitive disadvantage from the speciation of superior competitors. We have shown that the former effect emerges from our blended theory when intraspecific exceeds interspecific competition, while the latter effect emerges when interspecific exceeds intraspecific competition. Adding temporal environmental variation to our theory might allow the suggestion of Ricklefs (2003) to be implemented in a quantitative framework. Indeed, there is mounting evidence that temporal environmental variation should not be ignored in building biologically realistic models of community dynamics (Chisholm et al, 2014; Kalyuzhny et al, 2014).

Discussion

In his influential review of mechanisms for the maintenance of species diversity, Chesson (2000) notes that, “Models of unstable coexistence, in which species diversity slowly decays over time, have focused almost exclusively on equalizing mechanisms. These models would be more robust if they also included stabilizing mechanisms, which arise in many and varied ways but need not be adequate for full stability of a system. Models of unstable coexistence invite a broader view of diversity maintenance incorporating species turnover”. With the simple introduction of asymmetries in density-dependent ecological fitnesses, our blend of niche theory and Hubbell’s neutral theory embeds both stabilizing and destabilizing niche mechanisms within a neutral model of unstable drift, speciation, and dispersal (Vellend, 2010). We have discussed how niche stabilizing forces can resolve, simultaneously, two major problems in the dynamics of neutral theory, namely predictions of species lifetimes that are too short and species ages that are too long.

This niche remedy is a natural and biologically well-motivated solution. After all, much of the controversy surrounding Hubbell’s theory centers on the assumption of per capita equivalence in ecological fitness (see, e.g., Leibold and McPeck (2006)). Hubbell (2001) argued that life-history tradeoffs constrain niche differentiation to fitness-invariant manifolds. In our non-neutral framework, Hubbell’s theory lies along hyperplanes of parameter space where $w_{i,0} = w$ and $a_{ij} = a_j$ for all i and j . In this context, larger questions about the evolution of neutral or nearly neutral community dynamics boil down to a search for mechanisms driving the convergence of ecological fitnesses and interaction strengths. Toward this end, future work should integrate mechanistic niche models, such as the consumer-resource models of Tilman (1980, 1982), into a stochastic theory of unstable coexistence.

Many additional directions in model-building remain to be explored. In order to obtain testable predictions based on observations of non-cryptic, recognizable species, a protracted speciation mechanism, similar to Rosindell et al (2010), could be added to our general framework. Within this expanded framework, the techniques of Chisholm and O’Dwyer (2014) might allow for analytical calculations of expected species ages as a function of species abundance. Furthermore, because our nested analytical framework provides a natural interpolation between niche and neutral dynamics, it could serve as a pivot point from which additional features, already well-studied in niche-based models, could be incorporated into neutral models of speciation and drift. For example, niche-based models similar to Eq. 13 have been modified to include effects of habitat destruction (Tilman et al, 1994, 1997), leading to the discovery of the “extinction debt” in which species do not go extinct until long after habitat destruction takes place. This critical issue remains unexplored in the framework of neutral theory, where extinction debts could prolong species persistence times beyond those expected from the effects of demographic stochasticity alone.

Other work, such as Melbourne and Hastings (2008), highlights the need for model-building to move beyond considerations of simple demographic noise to incorporate explicit, parametric models of environmental stochasticity and demographic heterogeneity, among other sources of variation. O'Dwyer et al (2009) have integrated size-structure into Hubbell's theory, and our non-neutral model of unstable coexistence might be expanded in similar ways. Further efforts should also be made to incorporate niche stabilization into spatially explicit models of unstable coexistence. Incorporating space into Hubbell's theory has generated analytical predictions for clustering (Houchmandzadeh and Vallade, 2003), beta-diversity (Chave and Leigh, 2002; Zillio et al, 2005), and a tri-phasic species-area relationship (O'Dwyer and Green, 2010). The model-building efforts of Economo and Keitt (2008), Muneeppeerakul et al (2008), Babak and He (2009), and Vanpeteghem and Haegeman (2010) implement neutral dynamics over a distributed network of patches. This work should be expanded to incorporate asymmetries and mechanisms of niche stabilization and destabilization. Advances in stochastic modeling, both spatially-explicit and spatially-implicit, will underscore the importance of extended transients in ecological dynamics (Hastings, 2004, 2010) and provide novel insights on the early warning signals of extinction in deteriorating environments (Drake and Griffen, 2010).

The study of neutral theories has led to suggestions that emergent regularities, such as unimodal RSA distributions, imply a simplicity in the underlying dynamics of ecological communities. But increasingly, the opposite perspective is receiving attention. How much complexity can ecological theory embrace at the level of individuals without losing the ability to make testable predictions about large-scale patterns of biodiversity? Can we rigorously demonstrate how large-scale biogeographic regularities can emerge from the many irregularities of individual-based ecological interactions? Significant progress will be made if novel analysis techniques

can be developed for the macroscopic scaling of multi-species stochastic processes.

Box 1: An asymmetric extension of Hubbell’s neutral theory

Previous work, in collaboration with Nico Temme and Tim Keitt, introduced an analytical model of asymmetric, zero-sum community dynamics that contains Hubbell’s neutral theory of biodiversity in the symmetric limit (Noble et al, 2011). Our asymmetric metacommunity (M) retains Hubbell’s point-speciation model but allows for variation in ecological fitnesses, the w_i , and speciation probabilities, the ν_i , across species. Dynamics are governed by the master equation

$$\frac{dP_{\vec{n}}^M}{d\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^S \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^S \left(T_{ij\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i-\vec{e}_j}^M P_{\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i-\vec{e}_j}^M - T_{ji\vec{n}}^M P_{\vec{n}}^M \right) \Theta_{ij}^M, \quad (\text{B1.1})$$

where S is the total number of possible species, τ is a dimensionless measure of time, the \vec{e}_i are S -dimensional unit vectors, and the

$$T_{ij\vec{n}}^M = \frac{n_i}{J_M} \left((1 - \nu_j) \frac{w_j n_j}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k n_k - w_i} + \nu_j \frac{w_j}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{S}\right) \right), \quad (\text{B1.2})$$

are one-step transition probabilities for the removal of species i followed by the addition of species j , where $\mathcal{O}(1/S)$ indicates the presence of additional terms that are negligible as the number of species becomes large. The number of individuals, J_M , is fixed, and the accessible states are abundance vectors, (n_1, \dots, n_S) , where $\sum_{i=1}^S n_i = J_M$ and $0 \leq n_i \leq J_M$. The $\Theta_{ij}^M = \Theta(J_M - (n_i + 1))\Theta(n_j - 1)$, where $\Theta(x)$ is zero for $x < 0$ and one otherwise, ensure that transitions to inaccessible states are not included in Eq. B1.1. Note the absence of absorbing states: species have nonzero probabilities of re-introduction following an extinction event. However, as the number

of possible species becomes appropriately large, the probability of re-introduction becomes vanishingly small.

Our asymmetric local community (L) allows for variation in ecological fitnesses, the w_i , and immigration probabilities, the m_i , given fixed relative metacommunity abundances, the x_i . Dynamics are governed by the multivariate master equation

$$\frac{dP_{\vec{n}}^L}{d\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^S \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^S \left(T_{i,j,\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i-\vec{e}_j}^L P_{\vec{n}+\vec{e}_i-\vec{e}_j}^L - T_{j,i,\vec{n}}^L P_{\vec{n}}^L \right) \Theta_{ij}^L, \quad (\text{B1.3})$$

where

$$T_{i,j,\vec{n}}^L = \frac{n_i}{J_L} \left((1 - m_j) \frac{w_j n_j}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k n_k - w_i} + m_j \frac{w_j x_j}{\sum_{k=1}^S w_k x_k} \right). \quad (\text{B1.4})$$

The number of individuals, J_L , is fixed, and the accessible states are abundance vectors, (n_1, \dots, n_S) , where $\sum_{i=1}^S n_i = J_L$ and $0 \leq n_i \leq J_L$. The $\Theta_{ij}^L = \Theta(J_L - (n_i + 1))\Theta(n_j - 1)$ ensure that transitions to inaccessible states are not included in Eq. B1.3. Nonzero values for the m_i guarantee the absence of absorbing states and promote coexistence via mass-effects. In Hubbell's neutral theory, at equilibrium, expected relative abundances in the local community equal relative abundances in the metacommunity. By introducing interspecific heterogeneity in ecological fitness and migration probability, our asymmetric theory allows the expected local community composition to differ from the metacommunity composition.

Acknowledgments

This work originated in the lab of W. F. F. Comments from Rampal Etienne, Alan Hastings, Marcel Holyoak, and Tim Keitt as well as a thorough and insightful review from Ryan Chisholm significantly improved the quality of this manuscript. A. E. N. benefited from productive conversations with Sivan Leviyang and correspondence with Juliana Berbert. Our work was partially supported by the James

S. McDonnell Foundation through their Studying Complex Systems grant (220020138) to W. F. F.

Online Resources

Online Resource 1. Mean dynamics

According to Eq. 3.5.14 of Gardiner (2004), the mean dynamics of a multivariate Markov process is a system of ordinary differential equations given by an approximation that ignores correlations

$$\frac{dn_i}{dt} \sim A_i, \quad (\text{OR.1.1})$$

for each species i . The

$$n_i \equiv \sum_m m P(\vec{N}_i = m) \quad (\text{OR.1.2})$$

are promoted from a discrete index to a continuous variable and

$$A_i + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_{|\vec{m}-\vec{n}| < \epsilon} d\vec{m} (m_i - n_i) P(\vec{N}(t + \Delta t) = \vec{m} | \vec{N}(t) = \vec{n}), \quad (\text{OR.1.3})$$

are the first-order jump moments as defined by Eq. 3.4.2 of Gardiner (2004). For the transition probabilities of Eq. 7, we find

$$P(\vec{N}(t + \Delta t) = \vec{m} | \vec{N} = \vec{n}(t)) = \sum_{j=1}^S (\delta((\vec{m} + \vec{e}_j) - \vec{n}) g_{j,\vec{n}} + \delta((\vec{m} - \vec{e}_j) - \vec{n}) r_{j,\vec{n}}) \Delta t + o(\Delta t), \quad (\text{OR.1.4})$$

so

$$A_i = g_{i,\vec{n}} - r_{i,\vec{n}}, \quad (\text{OR.1.5})$$

and Eq. OR.1.1 yields Eq. 8. For the transition probabilities of Eq. 12, we find

$$P(\vec{N}(\tau + \Delta\tau) = \vec{m} | \vec{N} = \vec{n}(\tau)) = \sum_{k=1}^S \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^S (\delta((\vec{m} - \vec{e}_j + \vec{e}_k) - \vec{n}) T_{j,k,\vec{n}} + \delta((\vec{m} - \vec{e}_k + \vec{e}_j) - \vec{n}) T_{k,j,\vec{n}}) \Delta\tau + o(\Delta\tau), \quad (\text{OR.1.6})$$

so

$$A_i = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i} (T_{j,i,\vec{n}} - T_{i,j,\vec{n}}), \quad (\text{OR.1.7})$$

and Eq. OR.1.1, with $t \rightarrow \tau$, yields Eq. 13, given $p_i \equiv n_i/J$ and the assumption of sufficiently weak competitive asymmetry such that $w_{i,\vec{n}} \ll \sum_{k=1}^S w_{k,\vec{n}} n_k$ and $a_{ij} \ll \sum_{k=1}^S a_{ik} n_k$ for every i and j . A Kramers-Moyal expansion or Van Kampen system size expansion yields mean dynamics identical to the ones derived here (see, e.g., Gardiner (2004, p. 251)).

Online Resource 2. Obtaining the Ricker model from the mean dynamics of a simple birth-death process

Eq. 8 prescribes the single-species dynamics

$$\frac{dn_1}{dt} = n_1(w_{1,0}e^{-a_{11}n_1/w_{1,0}} - d_1). \quad (\text{OR.2.1})$$

Let $\tau = d_1 t$ and discretize the derivative to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n_{1\tau+1} &= n_{1\tau} + n_{1\tau} \left(\frac{w_{1,0}}{d_1} e^{-a_{11}n_{1\tau}/w_{1,0}} - 1 \right), \\ &= n_{1\tau} e^{r(1-n_{1\tau}/K)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.2.2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r &= \log(w_{1,0}/d_1), \\ K &= \frac{w_{1,0}}{a_{11}} \log(w_{1,0}/d_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.2.3})$$

Eq. OR.2.2 is the Ricker model.

Online Resource 3. The mean dynamics of a Moran model retains the zero-sum rule

Summing Eq. 13 over all species, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^S \frac{dp_i}{d\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^S c_i p_i \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^S p_j \right). \quad (\text{OR.3.1})$$

If $\sum_{j=1}^S p_i(0) = 1$, then $\sum_{i=1}^S dp_i/d\tau|_{\tau=0} = 0$, which is sufficient to guarantee that $\sum_{j=1}^S p_i(\tau) = 1$ for all τ .

Online Resource 4. Dynamics of a simple Moran model

In the $S = 2$ case of Eq. 11, the stochastic dynamics can be written, without approximation, as a univariate master equation for the marginal distribution of the first species

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{P_{n_1}}{d\tau} &= g_{n_1-1} \Theta(n_1 - 1) P_{n_1-1} + r_{n_1+1} \Theta(J - (n_1 + 1)) P_{n_1+1} \\ &\quad - (g_{n_1} \Theta(J - (n_1 + 1)) + r_{n_1} \Theta(n_1 - 1)) P_{n_1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.4.1})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} g_{n_1} &\equiv T_{2,1,(n_1,n_2)} \\ &= \frac{J - n_1}{J} \left(\frac{e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J - B_2 - a_{12}/w_{1,0} + a_{22}/w_{2,0})n_1}}{e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J - B_2 - a_{12}/w_{1,0} + a_{22}/w_{2,0})n_1} + J - n_1 - 1} \right), \\ r_{n_1} &\equiv T_{1,2,(n_1,n_2)} \\ &= \frac{n_1}{J} \left(\frac{J - n_1}{e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J - B_2 + a_{21}/w_{2,0} - a_{11}/w_{1,0})(n_1 - 1)} + J - n_1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.4.2})$$

This master equation also governs marginal dynamics for the asymmetric species in a nearly neutral community where all other species, labelled 2 thru S , are symmetric (see Noble et al (2011)).

To calculate the temporal evolution of *conditional* abundance probability distributions, as plotted in Fig. 1, we start by discretizing the univariate birth-death

process of Eq. OR.4.1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{n_1, \tau+1} &= g_{n_1-1} \Theta(n_1 - 1) P_{n_1-1, \tau} + r_{n_1+1} \Theta(J - (n_1 + 1)) P_{n_1+1, \tau} \\
&\quad + (1 - g_{n_1} \Theta(J - (n_1 + 1)) - r_{n_1} \Theta(n_1 - 1)) P_{n_1, \tau} \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^J P_{m, \tau} W_{mn_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{OR.4.3}$$

where

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - g_0 & g_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ r_1 & 1 - r_1 - g_1 & g_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & r_{J-1} & 1 - r_{J-1} - g_{J-1} & g_{J-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & r_J & 1 - r_J \end{pmatrix}. \tag{OR.4.4}$$

The unconditioned abundance probability distribution at any integer time τ , denoted \vec{P}_τ , is given by

$$\vec{P}_\tau = \vec{P}_0 W^\tau. \tag{OR.4.5}$$

The abundance probability distribution conditioned against extinction and monodominance is

$$P_{cn_1, \tau} \equiv \frac{P_{n_1, \tau}}{1 - P_{0, \tau} - P_{J, \tau}}, \tag{OR.4.6}$$

for $n_1 = 1, \dots, J - 1$.

Online Resource 5. Recovering non-zero-sum dynamics from zero-sum dynamics

Our general approach is to treat empty space as the $(S + 1)$ th species in a community of S species. Let $w_{(S+1),0}$ be the rate at which death events generate empty space and set all the a_{ij} to zero for $i, j = S + 1$. Given this setup, we consider the dynamics of a large- J community as $n_{S+1} \rightarrow J$.

Starting from the master equation for the Moran model in Eq. 11, we find

$$\begin{aligned} T_{i,S+1,\bar{n}} &\sim \frac{n_i}{J}, \\ T_{S+1,i,\bar{n}} &\sim \frac{w_{i,\bar{n}}}{w_{(S+1),0}} \frac{n_i}{J}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.5.1})$$

and all other transition probabilities are higher-order in n_i/J for $i \neq S+1$. Now let r be the overall transition rate. Rescaling $w_{i,\bar{n}} \rightarrow w_{(S+1),0} w_{i,\bar{n}}/r$, setting $\tau = rJt$, and identifying $T_{S+1,i}$ and $T_{i,S+1}$ with $g_{i,\bar{n}}$ and $r_{i,\bar{n}}$, respectively, we find that Eq. 11 reduces to Eq. 6 with $d_i = r$.

Starting from the mean dynamics of the Moran model in Eq. 13, and using $p_i = n_i/J$, we find

$$\frac{dn_i}{d\tau} \sim \frac{w_{i,\bar{n}}}{w_{(S+1),0}} \frac{n_i}{J} - \frac{n_i}{J}, \quad (\text{OR.5.2})$$

with all other terms being higher-order in n_i/J for $i \neq S+1$. The same rescalings as before yield Eq. 8 with $d_i = r$.

Online Resource 6. Corrections to stability criteria of the simple Moran model for low levels of speciation and migration

In a nearly neutral metacommunity where only the first species is distinct in ecological function, parameters for the symmetric species are identical: $w_{i,0} = w_{2,0}$ and $a_{ij} = a_{2j}$ for all $i > 1$ and all j . If the number of symmetric species, $S-1$, is large such that terms of $\mathcal{O}(S)$ can be ignored in Eq. 18, then the mean dynamics for the asymmetric species can be written as

$$\frac{dp_1}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{J_M} \frac{(1-\nu_1)e^{-((B_1+B_2)p_1-B_2)} - (1-\nu_2)}{e^{-((B_1+B_2)p_1-B_2)}p_1 + 1 - p_1} p_1(1-p_1) - \frac{\nu_2}{J_M} p_1, \quad (\text{OR.6.1})$$

where B_1 and B_2 are given by Eq. 16 with the substitution $J \rightarrow J_M$. The stable fixed point of the nearly neutral metacommunity can be calculated perturbatively in ν_1 and

ν_2 . At leading order, we find

$$\begin{aligned} p_1^* &= \frac{B_2 - C_{\nu_1}\nu_1 - C_{\nu_2}\nu_2}{B_1 + B_2} + \mathcal{O}(\nu_1^2, \nu_2^2, \nu_1\nu_2), \\ p_{i>1}^* &= \frac{1 - p_1^*}{S - 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.6.2})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\nu_1} &= 1, \\ C_{\nu_2} &= \frac{B_2}{B_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.6.3})$$

Stability requirements can be found from the linearization

$$\frac{dp_1}{d\tau} = -\frac{1}{J_M} \frac{(B_1 + D_{\nu_1}\nu_1)(B_2 + D_{\nu_2}\nu_2)}{B_1 + B_2} (p_1 - p_1^*) + \mathcal{O}(\nu_1^2, \nu_2^2, \nu_1\nu_2), \quad (\text{OR.6.4})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\nu_1} &= \frac{B_2^2 - B_1^2 - B_1B_2^2}{B_2(B_1 + B_2)}, \\ D_{\nu_2} &= \frac{B_2^2}{B_1^2} \left(2 - \frac{B_1B_2}{B_1 + B_2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.6.5})$$

For a nearly neutral local community, the dynamics of the asymmetric species, as prescribed by Eq. 21, can be written as

$$\frac{dp_1}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{J_M} \frac{(1 - \nu_1)e^{-((B_1+B_2)p_1-B_2)} - (1 - \nu_2)}{e^{-((B_1+B_2)p_1-B_2)}p_1 + 1 - p_1} p_1(1 - p_1) - \frac{\nu_2}{J_M} p_1, \quad (\text{OR.6.6})$$

where B_1 and B_2 are given by Eq. 16 with the substitution $J \rightarrow J_L$. The stable fixed point of the nearly neutral local community can be calculated perturbatively in m_1 and m_2 . At leading order, we find

$$\begin{aligned} p_1^* &= \frac{B_2 - C_{m_1}m_1 - C_{m_2}m_2}{B_1 + B_2} + \mathcal{O}(m_1^2, m_2^2, m_1m_2), \\ p_{i>1}^* &= \frac{1 - p_1^*}{S - 1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.6.7})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_{m_1} &= 1 - x_1 \frac{B_1 + B_2}{B_2}, \\ C_{m_2} &= \frac{B_2}{B_1} - x_1 \frac{B_1 + B_2}{B_1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.6.8})$$

Stability requirements can be found from the linearization

$$\frac{dp_1}{d\tau} = -\frac{1}{J_L} \frac{(B_1 + D_{m_1} m_1)(B_2 + D_{m_2} m_2)}{B_1 + B_2} (p_1 - p_1^*) + \mathcal{O}(m_1^2, m_2^2, m_1 m_2), \quad (\text{OR.6.9})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{m_1} &= \frac{1}{B_2^2(B_1 + B_2)} \left(B_2^3(1 - x_1) + 2B_1^2 B_2^2 x_1(1 - x_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - B_1 B_2 (B_1 + B_2^2(1 - x_1)^2 - 3B_1 x_1) + B_1^3 x_1(2 - B_2 x_1) \right), \\ D_{m_2} &= \frac{1}{B_1^2(B_1 + B_2)} \left(2B_2^3(1 - x_1) + 2B_1^2 B_2^2 x_1(1 - x_1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + B_1 B_2^2 (2 - B_2(1 - x_1)^2 - 3x_1) + B_1^3 x_1(1 - B_2 x_1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.6.10})$$

Online Resource 7. Calculation of extinction times in a nearly neutral metacommunity

If we assume a sufficiently large number of symmetric species such that $\mathcal{O}(1/S)$ terms in the master equation are negligible, marginal dynamics for the asymmetric species are governed by Eq. OR.4.1 with

$$\begin{aligned} g_{n_1} &= \frac{J_M - n_1}{J_M} \left((1 - \nu_1) \frac{e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J_M - B_2 - a_{12}/w_{1,0} + a_{22}/w_{2,0})n_1}}{e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J_M - B_2 - a_{12}/w_{1,0} + a_{22}/w_{2,0})n_1} + J_M - n_1 - 1} \right), \\ r_{n_1} &= \frac{n_1}{J_M} \left((1 - \nu_2) \frac{J_M - n_1}{e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J_M - B_2 + a_{21}/w_{2,0} - a_{11}/w_{1,0})(n_1 - 1)} + J_M - n_1} + \nu_2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.7.1})$$

where B_1 and B_2 are given by Eq. 16 with the substitution $J \rightarrow J_M$. Hubbell's univariate metacommunity dynamics (Hubbell 2001) are included as the fully

symmetric limit. For an initial abundance of $n_{1,0}$, the mean times to extinction, τ_E , are calculated using (Gardiner, 2004, p. 260)

$$\tau_E = \sum_{p=0}^{n_{1,0}-1} \phi_p^M \sum_{q=p+1}^{J_M-1} \frac{1}{g_q^M \phi_q^M}, \quad (\text{OR.7.2})$$

where $\phi_0^M = 1$ and for $p > 0$

$$\phi_p^M = \prod_{m=1}^p \frac{r_m^M}{g_m^M}. \quad (\text{OR.7.3})$$

Online Resource 8. Fluctuations in large local communities

In Hubbell's theory of local communities, the expected abundance of each species at equilibrium is

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \langle N_i(\tau) \rangle = x_i J_L. \quad (\text{OR.8.1})$$

Vallade and Houchmandzadeh (2003) first calculated the variance at equilibrium

$$\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \langle N_i(\tau) - \langle N_i(\tau) \rangle \rangle^2 = x_i(1 - x_i) J_L \frac{J_L + I}{1 + I}, \quad (\text{OR.8.2})$$

where $I = (J_L - 1)m/(1 - m)$ is called the “fundamental dispersal number” (Etienne and Alonso, 2005). Then, for large J_L , we obtain the approximation in Eq. 24.

Online Resource 9. A stationary distribution for the asymmetric species in a nearly neutral local community with weak competitive interactions

Marginal dynamics for the asymmetric species are governed by Eq. OR.4.1 with

$$\begin{aligned} g_{n_1} &= \frac{J_L - n_1}{J_L} \left((1 - m_1) \frac{\rho_g(n_1)n_1}{\rho_g(n_1)n_1 + J_L - n_1 - 1} + m_1 \frac{\rho_g(n_1)x_1}{\rho_g(n_1)x_1 + 1 - x_1} \right), \\ r_{n_1} &= \frac{n_1}{J_L} \left((1 - m_2) \frac{J_L - n_1}{\rho_r(n_1)(n_1 - 1) + J_L - n_1} + m_2 \frac{1 - x_1}{\rho_r(n_1)x_1 + 1 - x_1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{OR.9.1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_g(n_1) &= e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J_L - B_2 - a_{12}/w_{1,0} + a_{22}/w_{2,0})}, \\ \rho_r(n_1) &= e^{-((B_1+B_2)n_1/J_L - B_2 + a_{21}/w_{2,0} - a_{11}/w_{1,0})}.\end{aligned}\tag{OR.9.2}$$

and B_1 and B_2 are given by Eq. 16 with the substitution $J \rightarrow J_L$. We now assume weak competitive interactions such that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_g(n_1) &\sim 1 - ((B_1 + B_2)n_1/J_L - B_2 - a_{12}/w_{1,0} + a_{22}/w_{2,0}) \\ &\equiv c_g + dn_1, \\ \rho_r(n_1) &\sim 1 - ((B_1 + B_2)n_1/J_L - B_2 + a_{21}/w_{2,0} - a_{11}/w_{1,0}) \\ &\equiv c_r + dn_1,\end{aligned}\tag{OR.9.3}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}c_g &= 1 + \log \frac{w_{1,0}}{w_{2,0}} + (J_L - 1) \frac{a_{22}w_{1,0} - a_{12}w_{2,0}}{w_{1,0}w_{2,0}}, \\ c_r &= 1 + \log \frac{w_{1,0}}{w_{2,0}} + J_L \frac{a_{22}w_{1,0} - a_{12}w_{2,0}}{w_{1,0}w_{2,0}} + \frac{a_{11}w_{2,0} - a_{21}w_{1,0}}{w_{1,0}w_{2,0}}, \\ d &= -\frac{w_{1,0}(a_{22} - a_{21}) + w_{2,0}(a_{11} - a_{12})}{w_{1,0}w_{2,0}}.\end{aligned}\tag{OR.9.4}$$

We specialize to the case where $a_{11} = a_{22}$, $a_{12} = a_{21}$, and $w_{1,0} = w_{2,0}$, so that $c_g = c_r \equiv c$. The stationary distribution, $P_{n_1}^* \equiv \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} P_{n_1}(\tau)$, is given by a well-known formula

$$P_{n_1}^* = P_0^* \prod_{i=0}^{n_1-1} \frac{g_i}{r_{i+1}}.\tag{OR.9.5}$$

After some algebra, we obtain the closed form

$$\begin{aligned}P_{n_1}^* &= Z \binom{J_L}{n_1} \left(1 + \frac{x(c + dn_1)}{1 - x}\right) \eta^{n_1} (c/d)_{n_1} \\ &\times \frac{\text{B}(\lambda_{a+} + n_1, \xi_{a+} - n_1) \text{B}(\lambda_{a-} + n_1, \xi_{a-} - n_1)}{\text{B}(\lambda_{a+}, \xi_{a+}) \text{B}(\lambda_{a-}, \xi_{a-})} \\ &\times \frac{\text{B}(\lambda_{b+} + n_1, \xi_{b+} - n_1) \text{B}(\lambda_{b-} + n_1, \xi_{b-} - n_1)}{\text{B}(\lambda_{b+}, \xi_{b+}) \text{B}(\lambda_{b-}, \xi_{b-})},\end{aligned}\tag{OR.9.6}$$

where $(y)_z \equiv \Gamma(y+z)/\Gamma(y)$ is the Pochhammer symbol, $B(y, z) = \Gamma(y+z)/\Gamma(y)\Gamma(z)$ is the Beta function, and

$$\begin{aligned} Z^{-1} &= {}_6F_4(-J_L, c/d, \lambda_{a+}, \lambda_{a-}, \lambda_{b+}, \lambda_{b-}; 1 - \xi_{a+}, 1 - \xi_{a-}, 1 - \xi_{b+}, 1 - \xi_{b-}; -\eta) \\ &\quad + xc {}_6F_4(-J_L, c/d + 1, \lambda_{a+}, \lambda_{a-}, \lambda_{b+}, \lambda_{b-}; 1 - \xi_{a+}, 1 - \xi_{a-}, 1 - \xi_{b+}, 1 - \xi_{b-}; -\eta), \end{aligned} \tag{OR.9.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{a\pm} &= \frac{1}{2d} \left(c + d - 1 \pm \sqrt{(1 - c + d)^2 - 4d(J_L - 1)} \right), \\ \lambda_{b\pm} &= \frac{1}{2dx} \left(1 - m - x + cx \pm \sqrt{(1 - m - x + cx)^2 - 4mdx^2(J_L - 1)} \right), \\ \xi_{a\pm} &= \frac{1}{2d} \left(1 - c + 2d \pm \sqrt{(1 - c)^2 - 4d(J_L - 1)} \right), \\ \xi_{b\pm} &= \frac{1}{2d(m_2 - x)} \left(1 + (d - c)m_2 - (d - c + 1)x - (1 - m_2)dx(J_L - 1) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \pm \sqrt{(1 - (d + c)m_2 + (d + c - 1)x - (1 - m_2)dx(J_L - 1))^2 \dots} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \dots - 4(J_L - 1)d(m_2 - x)(x + x(c + d)(m_2 - 1) - 1) \right), \\ \eta &= \frac{dx}{m_2 - x}. \end{aligned} \tag{OR.9.8}$$

Eq. OR.9.6 is a generalized hypergeometric distribution (Kemp, 1968; Johnson et al, 1992).

References

- Adler PB, HilleRisLambers J, Levine JM (2007) A niche for neutrality. *Ecology Letters* 10:95–104
- Adler PB, Ellner SP, Levine JM (2010) Coexistence of perennial plants: an embarrassment of niches. *Ecology Letters* 13:1019–1029
- Allen LJS, Fagan JF, Högnäs G, Fagerholm H (2005) Population extinction in discrete-time stochastic population models with an allee effect. *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* 11:273–293
- Allouche O, Kadmon R (2009) A general framework for neutral models of community dynamics. *Ecology Letters* 12:1287–1297
- Alonso D, Etienne RS, McKane A (2006) The merits of neutral theory. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 21:452–456
- Babak P, He F (2009) A neutral model of edge effects. *Theoretical Population Biology* 75:76–83
- Caswell H (1976) Community structure: A neutral model analysis. *Ecological Monographs* 46:327–354
- Chase JM, Leibold MA (2003) *Ecological niches*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Chave J (2004) Neutral theory and community ecology. *Ecology Letters* 7:241–253
- Chave J, Leigh EG (2002) A spatially explicit neutral model of β -diversity in tropical forests. *Theoretical Population Biology* 62:153–168

- Chave J, Muller-Landau HC, Levin SA (2002) Comparing classical community models: theoretical consequences for patterns of diversity. *American Naturalist* 159:1–23
- Chave J, Alonso D, Etienne RS (2006) Comparing models of species abundance. *Nature* 441:E1–E2
- Chesson P (2000) Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of ecology and systematics* 31:343–366
- Chisholm RA, O’Dwyer JP (2014) Species ages in neutral biodiversity models. *Theoretical Population Biology* 93:85–94
- Chisholm RA, Pacala SW (2010) Niche and neutral models predict asymptotically equivalent species abundance distributions in high-diversity ecological communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:15,821–15,825
- Chisholm RA, Condit R, Rahman KA, Baker PJ, Bunyavejchewin S, Chen YY, Chuyong G, Dattaraja HS, Davies S, Ewango CEN, Gunatilleke CVS, Nimal Gunatilleke IAU, Hubbell S, Kenfack D, Kiratiprayoon S, Lin Y, Makana JR, Pongpattananurak N, Pulla S, Punchi-Manage R, Sukumar R, Su SH, Sun IF, Suresh HS, Tan S, Thomas D, Yap S (2014) Temporal variability of forest communities: empirical estimates of population change in 4000 tree species. *Ecology Letters* 17:855–865
- Dennis B (1989) Allee effects: population growth, critical density, and the chance of extinction. *Natural Resource Modeling* 3:481–538
- Dennis B (2002) Allee effects in stochastic populations. *Oikos* 96:389–401
- Drake JM, Griffen BD (2010) Early warning signals of extinction in deteriorating environments. *Nature* 467:456–459

- Economo EP, Keitt TH (2008) Species diversity in neutral metacommunities: a network approach. *Ecology Letters* 11:52–62
- Etienne RS (2005) A new sampling formula for neutral biodiversity. *Ecology Letters* 8:253–260
- Etienne RS, Alonso D (2005) A dispersal-limited sampling theory for species and alleles. *Ecology Letters* 8:1147–1156
- Etienne RS, Olf H (2005) Confronting different models of community structure to species-abundance data: a Bayesian model comparison. *Ecology Letters* 8:493–504
- Etienne RS, Alonso D, McKane A (2007) The zero-sum assumption in neutral biodiversity theory. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 248:522–536
- Ewens WJ (2004) *Mathematical population genetics*, 2nd edn. Springer, Amsterdam
- Fagan WF, Holmes EE (2006) Quantifying the extinction vortex. *Ecology Letters* 9:51–60
- Gardiner CW (2004) *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, 3rd edn. Springer-Verlag, Berlin
- Gravel D, Canham CD, Beaudet M, Messier C (2006) Reconciling niche and neutrality: the continuum hypothesis. *Ecology Letters* 9:399–409
- Haegeman B, Etienne RS (2008) Relaxing the zero-sum assumption in neutral biodiversity theory. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 252:288–294
- Haegeman B, Loreau M (2011) A mathematical synthesis of niche and neutral theories in community ecology. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 269:150–165

- Hastings A (2004) Transients: the key to long-term ecological understanding? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 19:39–45
- Hastings A (2010) Timescales, dynamics, and ecological understanding. *Ecology* 91(12):3471–3480
- Houchmandzadeh B, Vallade M (2003) Clustering in neutral ecology. *Physical Review E* 68:061,912
- Hubbell SP (2001) *The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography*. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Jabot F, Etienne RS, Chave J (2008) Reconciling neutral community models and environmental filtering: theory and an empirical test. *Oikos* 117:1308–1320
- Jeraldo P, Sipos M, Chia N, Brulec JM, Dhillon AS, Konkel ME, Larson CL, Nelson KE, Qu A, Schook LB, Yang F, White BA, Goldenfeld N (2012) Quantification of the relative roles of niche and neutral processes in structuring gastrointestinal microbiomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:9692–9698
- Johnson NL, Kotz S, Kemp AW (1992) *Univariate discrete distributions*, 2nd edn. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley and Sons, New York
- Kadmon R, Allouche O (2007) Integrating the effects of area, isolation, and habitat heterogeneity on species diversity: a unification of island biogeography and niche theory. *American Naturalist* 170:443–454
- Kalyuzhny M, Schreiber Y, Chocron R, Flather CH, Kadmon R, Kessler DA, Shnerb NM (2014) Temporal fluctuation scaling in populations and communities. *Ecology* 95:1701–1709

- Kelly C, Bowler M, Pybus O, Harvey PH (2008) Phylogeny, niches, and relative abundance in natural communities. *Ecology* 89:962—970
- Kemp AW (1968) Studies in univariate discrete distribution theory based on the generalized hypergeometric function and associated differential equations. PhD thesis, The Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast
- Lande R (1993) Risks of population extinction from demographic and environmental stochasticity and random catastrophes. *American Naturalist* 142:911—927
- Leibold MA, McPeck MA (2006) Coexistence of the niche and neutral perspectives in community ecology. *Ecology* 87:1399–1410
- Leigh EG (1981) The average lifetime of a population in a varying environment. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 90:213—239
- Levine JM, HilleRisLambers J (2009) The importance of niches for the maintenance of species diversity. *Nature* 461:254–257
- Levins R, Culver D (1971) Regional coexistence of species and competition between rare species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 68:1246–1248
- Loreau M, de Mazancourt C (2008) Species synchrony and its drivers: neutral and nonneutral community dynamics in fluctuating environments. *The American Naturalist* 172:E48–E66
- Marani M, Zillio T, Belluco E, Silvestri S, Maritan A (2006) Non-neutral vegetation dynamics. *PLoS One* 1:e78
- McGill BJ (2003) A test of the unified neutral theory of biodiversity. *Nature* 422:881–885

- Mcgill BJ, Etienne RS, Gray JS, Alonso D, Anderson MJ, Benecha HK, Dornelas M, Enquist BJ, Green JL, He F, Hurlbert AH, Magurran AE, Marquet PA, Maurer BA, Ostling A, Soykan CU, Ugland KI, White EP (2007) Species abundance distributions: moving beyond single prediction theories to integration within an ecological framework. *Ecology letters* 10:995–1015
- Melbourne BA, Hastings A (2008) Extinction risk depends strongly on factors contributing to stochasticity. *Nature* 454:100—103
- Morris WF, Doak D (2003) Quantitative conservation biology: theory and practice of population viability analysis. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts
- Muneepeerakul R, Bertuzzo E, Lynch HJ, Fagan WF, Rinaldo A, Rodriguez-Iturbe I (2008) Neutral metacommunity models predict fish diversity patterns in Mississippi-Missouri basin. *Nature* 453:220—222
- Mutshinda CM, O’Hara RB (2011) Integrating the niche and neutral perspectives on community structure and dynamics. *Oecologia* 166:241–251
- Mutshinda CM, O’Hara RB, Woiwod IP (2008) Species abundance dynamics under neutral assumptions: a Bayesian approach to the controversy. *Functional Ecology* 22:340–347
- Nee S (2005) The neutral theory of biodiversity: do the numbers add up? *Functional Ecology* 19:173–176
- Nisbet R, Gurney W (2003) Modelling Fluctuating Populations. Blackburn Press, Caldwell, New Jersey
- Noble AE, Temme NM, Fagan WF, Keitt TH (2011) A sampling theory for asymmetric communities. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 273:1–14

- O'Dwyer JP, Chisholm RA (2014) A mean field model for competition: from neutral ecology to the Red Queen. *Ecology letters* 17:961–969
- O'Dwyer JP, Green J (2010) Field theory for biogeography: a spatially explicit model for predicting patterns of biodiversity. *Ecology Letters* 13:87–95
- O'Dwyer JP, Lake J, Ostling A, Savage V (2009) An integrative framework for stochastic, size-structured community assembly. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106:6170–6175
- Ofițeru ID, Lunn M, Curtis TP, Wells GF, Criddle CS, Francis CA, Sloan WT (2010) Combined niche and neutral effects in a microbial wastewater treatment community. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:15,345–15,350
- Ovaskainen O, Meerson B (2010) Stochastic models of population extinction. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 25:643–652
- Pigolotti S, Cencini M (2013) Species abundances and lifetimes: From neutral to niche-stabilized communities. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 338:1–8
- Pigolotti S, Flammini A, Marsili M, Maritan A (2005) Species lifetime distribution for simple models of ecologies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102:15,747–15,751
- Purves DW, Pacala SW (2005) Ecological drift in niche-structured communities: neutral pattern does not imply neutral process. In: Burslem D, Pinard M, Hartley S (eds) *Biotic Interactions in the Tropics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 107–138
- Ricklefs R (2003) A comment on Hubbell's zero-sum ecological drift model. *Oikos* 100:185–192

- Ricklefs R (2006) The unified neutral theory of biodiversity: Do the numbers add up? *Ecology* 87:1424–1431
- Rosindell J, Cornell S, Hubbell SP, Etienne RS (2010) Protracted speciation revitalizes the neutral theory of biodiversity. *Ecology Letters* 13:716–727
- Stokes CJ, Archer SR (2010) Niche differentiation and neutral theory: an integrated perspective on shrub assemblages in a parkland savanna. *Ecology* 91:1152–1162
- Tilman D (1980) A graphical-mechanistic approach to competition and predation. *American Naturalist* 116:362–393
- Tilman D (1982) Resource competition and community structure. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Tilman D (2004) Niche tradeoffs, neutrality, and community structure: A stochastic theory of resource competition, invasion, and community assembly. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101:10,854–10,861
- Tilman D, May RM, Lehman CL, Nowak MA (1994) Habitat destruction and the extinction debt. *Nature* 371:65–66
- Tilman D, Lehman CL, Yin C (1997) Habitat destruction, dispersal, and deterministic extinction in competitive communities. *American Naturalist* 149:407–435
- Vallade M, Houchmandzadeh B (2003) Analytical solution of a neutral model of biodiversity. *Physical Review E* 68:061,902
- Van Kampen NG (2001) Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry. North-Holland, Amsterdam

- Vandermeer JH (1975) Interspecific competition: a new approach to the classical theory. *Science* 188:253–255
- Vanpeteghem D, Haegeman B (2010) An analytical approach to spatio-temporal dynamics of neutral community models. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 61(3):323–357
- Vellend M (2010) Conceptual synthesis in community ecology. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 85:183–206
- Volkov I, Banavar JR, Hubbell SP, Maritan A (2003) Neutral theory and relative species abundance in ecology. *Nature* 424:1035–1037
- Volkov I, Banavar JR, He F, Hubbell SP, Maritan A (2005) Density dependence explains tree species abundance and diversity in tropical forests. *Nature* 438:658–661
- Volkov I, Banavar JR, Hubbell SP, Maritan A (2009) Inferring species interactions in tropical forests. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106:13,854–13,859
- Walker SC (2007) When and why do non-neutral metacommunities appear neutral? *Theoretical population biology* 71:318–331
- Zillio T, Volkov I, Banavar JR, Hubbell SP, Maritan A (2005) Spatial scaling in model plant communities. *Physical Review Letters* 95:098,101




Figure 1: Plots of the temporal evolution of conditional abundance probability distributions, $P_{cn_1, \tau}$ (see Online Resource 4). For all plots, $J = 100$ and $w_{1,0} = w_{2,0}$; the initial condition is $P_{cn_1,0} = \delta_{n_1, J/2}$; and the vertical axis is labelled by relative abundance, $p_1 \equiv n_1/J$. Panels a, b, and c correspond, respectively, to scenarios of neutrality ($a_{1j} = a_{2j}$ for $j = 1, 2$), interspecific exceeding intraspecific competition ($a_{11}, a_{22} = 0.1/J < a_{21}, a_{12} = 0.2/J$), and intraspecific exceeding interspecific competition ($a_{11}, a_{22} = 0.2/J > a_{21}, a_{12} = 0.1/J$). In all cases, the conditional probabilities approach a quasi-stationary distribution at long times. An excess of interspecific competition destabilizes the system, relative to the neutral scenario, by inducing a stochastic Allee effect and accelerating extinction for rare species. By contrast, an excess of intraspecific competition generates a single peak in the quasi-stationary distribution and delays extinction. Note that the peaks in $P_{cn_1, \tau}$ will approach delta functions in the $J \rightarrow \infty$ limit and the mean dynamics of the Levins niche model will be recovered in the absence of demographic stochasticity. For finite J , absorbing states guarantee monodominance by a single species at long times, while niche dynamics accelerate or delay extinction on intermediate time scales.




Figure 2: A summary of connections among the blended stochastic processes and deterministic models, as discussed in the first part of this paper. The second part develops non-neutral extensions of Hubbell’s metacommunity and local community models by adding speciation and immigration, respectively, to the Niche-Moran process. All models contain a neutral theory in the symmetric limit.




Figure 3: Panel a plots mean times to extinction, τ_E , against initial relative abundance, $p_{1,0} \equiv n_{1,0}/J_M$, for the asymmetric species in a nearly neutral metacommunity with $J_M = 100$ individuals, while panel b plots the corresponding flows, $dp_1/d\tau$ versus p_1 , of the mean dynamics. We assume equivalence in speciation probability, with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = 0.01$, and intrinsic ecological fitness, such that $w_{1,0} = w_{2,0}$. In the fully neutral limit, where $a_{1j} = a_{2j}$ for $j = 1, 2$, all species drift steadily toward extinction. For the case of interspecific exceeding intraspecific competition, where $a_{11}, a_{22} = 0.1/J_M < a_{21}, a_{12} = 0.2/J_M$, mean time to extinction for the asymmetric species falls below (above) neutral expectations when relative abundance is low (high). The existence of an inflection point in the τ_E versus $p_{1,0}$ curve signals a stochastic Allee effect, as confirmed by the mean dynamics where an unstable threshold separates an upper and a lower stable fixed point. Only intraspecific exceeding interspecific competition, where $a_{11}, a_{22} = 0.2/J_M > a_{21}, a_{12} = 0.1/J_M$, raises τ_E above neutral expectations for all values of $p_{1,0}$. The corresponding mean dynamics include a stable fixed point that promotes stable coexistence over intermediate time scales as well as an unstable fixed point that repels drift toward extinction.




Figure 4: Panel a plots the asymptotic (stationary) probabilities, the $P_{n_1}^*$, that the asymmetric species attains abundance n_1 in a nearly neutral local community of $J_L = 100$ individuals. Panel b plots the corresponding flows, curves of $dp_1/d\tau$, in the mean dynamics of the asymmetric species. The relative metacommunity abundance is $x_1 = 0.25$; the migration probabilities are symmetric with $m_1 = m_2 = 0.01$; and intrinsic ecological fitnesses are equivalent, such that $w_{1,0} = w_{2,0}$. In the fully neutral limit, the stationary distribution is bimodal and large fluctuations between extirpation and monodominance destabilize the community. Probabilities of coexistence decline further when interspecific exceeds intraspecific competition, such that $a_{11}, a_{22} = 0.1/J_M < a_{21}, a_{12} = 0.2/J_M$, and the mean dynamics exhibit an Allee effect. By contrast, intraspecific exceeding interspecific competition such that $a_{11}, a_{22} = 0.2/J_M > a_{21}, a_{12} = 0.1/J_M$, generates a metastability at intermediate abundance that fosters coexistence over intermediate time scales and delays extirpation. That metastability corresponds to a stable fixed point in the mean dynamics, where flows away from extirpation and monodominance further reduce the probability of large fluctuations.